Marx's theory of colonisation and contemporary Eastern Cape (South Africa) historiography.

C. Engelbrecht

(Revised 2019)

Abstract

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to apply Marx's 'modern' theory of systematic colonisation to Eastern Cape history. As a result, the focus of this paper is limited to Chapter XXXIII of Marx's *Capital*, Vol.1, pp.717–724.

At first it seems a stretch of imagination – almost as if there is a need to first 'decontextualize' the 'historicist commonplace from the context in which the theory was originally used' (Adorno 2009: xiv) before we can consider Marx's theory suitable for our purposes. To develop and apply an appropriate theory (as Marx did) is no easy task. When analysing the subject matter critically, we need to keep in mind that a Critical Theory, according to Horkheimer, needs to fulfil at least three criteria: the theory needs to 'be explanatory, practical, and normative, all at the same time' (Bohman in Rasmussen 1996: 190). Secondly, Eastern Cape history between 1806 and 1910 was closely linked to British colonisation strategies within the expanding European economy (Inggs 1988: 61; Dickason 2005: 36–37) – in fact, the growing European economy strengthened Britain's global position both politically and economically. It was during the middle of this period, that Marx described colonising England as the 'despot of the world-market' (Marx 1985: 18). Lastly, Marx's writings are complex, often rather hurried, incomplete, semantically inconsistent, and even vague at times. Therefore, a secondary challenge in this paper was to reduce the abstract stance of Marx's theory.

In order to consider the value of Marx's theory, we need to keep in mind that for decades, the South African historian CFJ Muller's emphasis on financial and commercial factors, imperialism and the protection of the interests of the British empire, as well as philanthropic factors, were generally accepted as sufficient explanatory variables of the relationship between British colonial policy and e.g. the Great Trek (Muller 1969). However, argued Muller, one needs to be mindful that we cannot realistically accept that there existed a comprehensive British blueprint colonial 'policy' towards South Africa. At best, these four factors jointly influenced colonial practices, specifically against the background of the nature of British colonial administration (Muller 1974: 171).

Whilst the influence of each of these factors varied from time to time, their individual importance must not be seen as static. Marx was well aware of these factors – of course, at the time, he did not use them in the same neat format as Muller did in his own research about the Great Trek from the 1960s onwards.

A second reason for the unique colonial practices towards South Africa can be interpreted against the background of the influence of propagandists both in and outside South Africa, regarding the promotion of their South African interests (Muller 1974: 171). One such interest included their respective relationships with the local press. *The Graham's Town Journal,* for instance, wrote Harrington, 'tempered and shaped an exiting [public opinion] one' and in 'the very course of articulating this public opinion the *Journal* mirrored it faithfully' (Harrington 1973: 109).

The above interpretations were extended in this study by including aspects of contemporary Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School. The conclusion herein hints at a proposed explanatory model for further future research, by combining Marx's theory of systematic colonization with Muller's four factors as they relate to British colonial policy at the time.

Unlike Machiavelli (Machiavelli 2009: 16–17), Marx's theory did not specifically deal with the political individual in the colonizing process. This paper also excludes Althusser's treatments of Machiavellian theory (Althusser 2000: 69 ff). However, for the sake contextual background, the above requires general comments about colonialism.

2. General observations about colonialism

Colonists live in an area (a colony) that is colonised by the colonial (colonising) mother country. The colonising process of a particular country took place in accordance with the mother country's specific practices and methods – *viz.* usually securing some form of comprehensive domination as a hegemonic strategy. Naturally, strategic options and implementation practices differed from time to time and from the one colonial power to the next.

Some colonising practices included the introduction (or perpetuation) of slave labour, or other forms of exploitation of the inhabitants and or the resources of the colony. Whereas colonialism (as a practice) was closely linked to the concept of imperialism (as an ideology), the primary reason for colonising (the act of taking over) a territory, was to exercise some form of strategic consideration. Such might have been to acquire raw materials, to have acquired more markets, to have had access to cheap labour, or for political/military strategic considerations. For instance,

> 'the start of the conflict between Britain and France at the end of the 18th century, sees Britain taking the strategically important step of militarily occupying the Cape in 1795: for fear that the Dutch would turn it over to the French and thereby cut the British sea route to the East' (King 2005: 2).

Clearly, 'foreign policy' Landsberg wrote recently (although in a contemporary context), 'is ultimately determined by domestic affairs' (Landsberg 2010: 3).

As far back as the Classical times, the Greeks and Phoenicians established colonies on empty lands. Then, during the Middle Ages, nomadic horsemen informally settled on, or formally invaded (be it on a limited scale) land that they fancied. The history of African colonisation over fellow African peoples, are fact. Colonisation is not just a white men's European thing. Arguments to the contrary of such, are confined to a false consciousness. The modern colonial era of imperialism, however, refers to Western Europe that, to varying degrees, established colonies in America, Africa and Oceania. Today, *neo*-colonialism manifests itself in a form of 'unofficial colonisation' – one that does not necessarily include possession or legal control of an area, nor

inevitably seeks to expand native civilization. Such argument, however, seems a contradiction in terms.

Conventional arguments held that through a practise of colonising different territories, civilization was supposedly strengthened in the new territory; Christianity introduced; the advantages of technological developments were implemented, and that somehow, a 'better life' would result for all inhabitants. In one form or another, these 'benefits' were put forward by the Colonial Office as reasons to justify the 1820 Settler scheme to South Africa. Such can be interpreted in accordance with our comments about means and goals in the following section. Today however, neo-colonialism (or 'unofficial colonisation') is characterised by spatial separation between the colonising power and the new society. This essentially represents a form of ideological control (or influence) over the colonial inhabitants. In extreme forms, neo-colonialism shows elements of excessive national pride and an over-zealous passion for its own selfish (mainly capitalistic) interests. Thus, the philosophy that underpins colonisation, as well as the accompanying practices thereof, changed over centuries – *viz.* from invading land, to acquiring non-political control over other countries. Generally, in all instances some form of exploitation of man and material followed.

It is against these few general observations that we will list, and then expand on Marx's four different uses of colonialism.

3. Marx's four different uses of the term 'systematic colonisation'

For the sake of space, the above general observations about colonialism will have to suffice for this analysis. When studying the concept "systematic colonisation," it would be wise to be cognisant of Hegel who maintained that a "philosophical account of the essential content needs a scientific and objective treatment" (Hegel 2005: xxi). This was our approach herein.

Marx used the term "systematic colonialism" four times in Chapter XXXIII of *Capital* Vol. 1 (Marx 1983: 717–719, 723) - and in our view, in different contexts. In the first instance, he described Wakefield's apparent discovery that "systematic colonisation" took place *when the mother country artificially created manufacturing capitalists* and also how wageworkers arose in the colonies as a result (Marx 1983: 717). By this is understood that the mother country herself was "colonised" in a

systematic manner through the expansion of capitalist manufactures. Gradually, capitalists covered the mother country until a point when the entire society was subjected to exploitive capitalist control. In turn (and systematically), the manufacturing capitalists then artificially created wageworkers in the colonies of the mother country in order to benefit the interests of the former. In this manner, capitalism was extended – both nationally and extra-territorially. These characterises represent in our view, a form of unregulated colonialism, *viz.* the uncontrolled (or unchecked) and mostly unopposed advance of capitalist objectives in the colony.

In the second context, Marx explained that "systematic colonisation" is *a tool* (or a means) *for advancing capitalism.* In this instance, systematic colonisation was called upon to achieve specific capitalist objectives in the colony – in other words, "to replace [...] unregulated colonialism" (Marx 1983: 718) with a specific desired political ideology. Viewed in this way, the suggestion is created to imply the presence of one or more instrumental value leading up to the goal or objective that the mother country had in mind. Before a goal can be reached, means must assist to reach the respective goals leading up to an end state. These goals are arranged in a hierarchy. Each level is to be considered as an end relative to the levels below it, and simultaneously, as a means only relative to the immediate levels directly above them (Van Dyke 1978: 11).

Thirdly, "systematic colonisation" according to Marx, is *a strategy* (a deliberate course of action) to be taken (mostly for the worse) against the subjected colonial populations. This was followed, e.g. by creating slavery as the "sole basis of colonial wealth" (Marx 1983: 719) in order to secure capital for the ruling class. Slavery was both a relationship between individuals as it was a social institution (Mason in Eldridge and Morton 1994: 71).

Lastly, Marx viewed "systematic colonisation" as *an end state* or an intended desired state (Marx 1983: 723) - explained not only in terms of reasons or causes, but also in terms of needs or future end states, and how they are to be satisfied. In a sense, ends are normative and can alternatively be considered as means, and again also as ends.

Essentially, systematic colonisation meant a process of dispossession of the labourer who stood to lose the most – at least in the material sense of the word. This process of dispossession of the labourer manifested itself in different forms. First, by ensuring low wages and through different forms of legalized protection, capitalists

secured their material positions in the mother country at the expense of the labourer. The supply and demand of labour, the relative wages paid, the allocation or appropriation of land through political and other forms of dominance or subjection of the working class, all seemed to follow the labourer where-ever s/he went in the local and overseas (or colonial) markets. In this sense, a parallel can be drawn between British colonial expansionism that followed the Dutch in South Africa when they left the Cape Colony in search for their independence.

Secondly, systematic colonisation was consequently not to be restricted to a geo-political term, but should rather be seen as a comprehensive, organized and society-wide capitalist ideological bourgeoisie strategy to dominate poorer sections of the population. Therefore, systematic colonialism is trans-national (or global) in scope, and exploitive political economics in nature – combined, at the expense of the poor in society.

Thirdly, the process of systematic colonisation is a form of "societal creeping" (or invasion). This omnipresence of "societal creeping" spreads from one individual to another, from one collective workplace to others, from lower to higher organizational levels and finally, from one colony to another.

In the South African context, geo-political differences and continual British occupation of the local inhabitants (of all races), led Saunders to conclude that "[by] 1894 the annexation procedure had become routine" (Saunders 1976: 168).

4. Political economic differences between mother country and colony

According to Marx, political economics confused two forms of private property, *viz.* private property based on the *producers' own labour,* and private property based on the employed *labour of other people* (Marx 1983: 716). By the 1860s (and less than a decade before the discovery of diamonds and soon thereafter gold in South Africa) - at the time when Marx wrote his theory of systematic colonisation - Western Europe was regarded as the centre of political economy of the world. This was because the process of primitive accumulation that was based primarily on exploiting the labouring of others, was already party achieved in Europe.

There were two reasons for this situation. Firstly, capitalist regimes had either gained direct control over all production in its own country, or secondly, in situations where less developed economic conditions still prevailed, then in such instances the

mother country at least indirectly controlled those strata of society that continued to use antiquated modes of production. Here, the political economists applied the rules of law and of property, as bases for their control of selfish capitalist accumulation. In both situations above, own labour and that of other people, were regarded as building blocks for the favourable political economic position that Britain enjoyed.

The situation in the colonies however, was different, because there two opposing economic systems co-existed. The first economic system was that of the local producer who enriched himself at the expense of the capitalist. Such enrichment was possible because producers owned and employed their own conditions of labour. However, when the relations between producer and capitalist were disturbed or became strained, producers resisted the situation and their animosity resulted in conflict. This was conflict between the capitalist regime and the local (colonist) producer. The second economic system was one where capitalists had the support, resources and the power of the mother country at their disposal to pursue their own interests. In this self-serving accumulation process, the capitalist will destroy (sometimes even forcefully) those modes of production and appropriation that might have been based on the independent labour of the local (colonial) producer.

The various interests (e.g. labour, capital, trade political control), that motivated the political economist in the mother country to emphasize the theoretical identity of the capitalist mode of production, those same interests made him/her in the colonies to define the antagonisms that existed between private labour and the labour of others. One such interest was the relation that existed between available labour and capital. The capitalist proved how the development of the social productive power of e.g. labour, cooperation, division of labour, and extensive use of machines, could not exist without the expropriation of the labourers and the accompanying change of their means of production into capital. In Marx's view, both (interests and means of production) benefited only the selfish interests of the bourgeoisie in society.

In order to serve the supposed national interests (was Marx's view on behalf of the workers) the capitalist instead employed all fake means to ensure the poverty of the people. Wakefield maintained that the true reason for the conditions of capitalist production in the mother country was to be found in the colonies**.** His theory of colonisation (that he termed "systematic colonisation") was that through various forms of protection, manufacturing capitalists were artificially created in the mother

country. Likewise, the mother-country then created wage-workers in the colonies to ensure their interests would be best served.

Marx also argued that Wakefield discovered that in the colonies, property (in the form of money, or means of subsistence, or machines, or other means of production) alone, could not characterize someone as a capitalist. The missing element (according to Marx), was the correlative of the capitalist – *viz.* the wageworker. This meant that capital was not "a thing in itself," but rather a *social relation* of production between people – *viz.* the capitalist and wageworker.

The same is the case with the means of production. These, together with subsistence, that are both the property of the primary producer (Marx 1983: 717) are in themselves, not capital. The missing elements (again, in Marx's view), were the exploitation and subjection of the labourer by the capitalist. Only when the labourer was exploited and subjected by the capitalist, only then the means of production and subsistence of the labourer became capital in the hands of the capitalist. Therefore, argued Wakefield, if all men possessed equal portions of capital, then no-one would have a motive for accumulating more capital than he could require for his own needs. But this is not what is happening in the case of new American settlements where the desire to own land, prevented a class of labourers to hire their own land. Stated dialectically, if the labourers would be in control and accumulate and possesses for himself, his own means of production, then capitalist accumulation and capitalistic mode of production would be impossible because the labourers would certainly not exploit themselves.

But how did it happen that the labourer in Old Europe was dispossessed from his conditions of labour? In other words, how did it happen that one finds the existence of both capital and wage labour? This came about as a result of a unique "social contract" – one that promoted the accumulation of capital as well as the division of people between *owners of capital* and *owners of labour*. One would expect that in the colonies the dream of "accumulation of capital" would be turned into reality. Instead, systematic colonisation was relied on by the mother country to achieve the opposite. The reality is that self-expropriation by the labouring humanity (Marx 1983: 718) in favour of capital, exists so little that slavery became the sole natural basis of colonial wealth. As a result, systematic colonisation was a course of action taken for the worse (from the perspective of the labourer), because the capitalist had to deal with free men and not slaves. Without labourers, capital would become extinct, or at least be

reduced to such low levels what each individual could employ with his own hands. This is what happened to Settlers in the Eastern Cape who did not have sufficient labour, and who accumulated more capital than they could employ with their own hands. Slavery was, to some extent, a means of solving their problem.

Fundamentally, the basis of capitalist mode of production is the dispossession of masses of people from their lands, and the labourers from the little capital that they might have had. A free colony on the other hand, essentially consists of a majority of land that is still public property so that every settler on it can turn part thereof into his private property and individual means of production, without hindering other settlers. This situation simultaneously determines colonial prosperity, as well as its limitations – the opposition to the establishment of capital by the capitalist. Where land is cheap and where everyone can obtain a piece of land for himself, but on the other hand where labour is expensive as is the labourer's share to produce, then the difficulty remains to obtain labour at any price.

It is clear from the above that the correct conditions do not yet exist. The correct conditions refer to the labourer who is not yet separated from the conditions of labour or its root, *viz.* land. If it does, it is either too limited or too sporadic. Neither does the separation of agriculture from industry exist, nor the destruction of the household industry of the peasantry. In the colonies, the same is the case. Therefore: when will the internal market for capital eventually appear?

To answer this question, Marx outlined the American conditions for an internal market, as follows: no part of the American population is exclusively agricultural, except slaves and their employers who combine capital and labour in particular work. For instance, Free Americans who cultivate land, practised other occupations as well. They would make their own furniture and tools that they might require, or carry to the local market the goods they produced. In some instances, they were spinners and weavers; they made soap, candles, shoes, and clothes for their own use. The cultivation of land was often secondary (Marx 1983: 719) to being e.g. a blacksmith, miller or shopkeeper. It is therefore not surprising that under such conditions, there were little incentive to abstain from capitalism.

Capitalist production consists, firstly, of the constant reproduction of wage-workers as wage-workers. Secondly, it produced a relative surplus-population of wageworkers in relation to the accumulation of capital. The result is that the supply and demand of labour are both kept in balance. In addition, the fluctuations of wages

are kept within satisfactory limits to capitalist exploitation. Lastly, the indispensable perquisite of social dependence of the labourer on the capitalist is maintained. The relation of such dependence is kept which the political economist in the mother country can change into a free contract between buyer and seller, *viz.* between owner of commodities and owner of labour.

The situation in the colony is different. Because labourers entered the colony as ready-made adults, the population increased faster than that of the mother country. This overstocks the local labour market. The Old World then puts more capital into the market in anticipation of further self-serving exploitation. This resulted in conflict between demand and supply, and the wageworker of today became the independent peasant or artisan of tomorrow, working for himself and in so doing, enriches himself instead of the capitalist. It follows that under these circumstances, exploitation is low.

When such conditions prevail, the supply of labour is neither constant nor sufficient and the wageworker finds it difficult to become a capitalist (Marx 1983: 720). However, should the labourer import labour for his requirements with his own money, he eventually becomes an independent capitalist landowner – essentially, he becomes a competitor to their former masters in the labour market. In so doing, the capitalist has introduced his own capitalist competition. Consequently, there is no more dependence on the wageworkers of the colonies. This results in a demand in the colonies for wageworkers as a cheap, subservient class to whom terms and conditions of their existence can be dictated to by their capitalist exploiters. These new relations then needed to be regulated artificially – e.g. through parliamentary means.

The result is the dispersion of capitalist producers and of national wealth; the dividing of the means of production amongst wage-labourers, which are all for their own account, destroys all the foundations of combined labour. To this, there is no centralization of capital (Marx 1983: 721). Worse are the large projects that are often prevented from being carried out. Although capital might be available, a shortage of labour was the preventative factor. This was not a problem in Europe. If however, labour were secured, one would have engaged into the project even at higher wage prices as long as one can be sure of the constant labour supply.

But how are these anti-capitalistic situations in the colonies to be resolved? If free men (and women) were willing to change land, from public to private property, then such practice would destroy the colonies. In turn, when the government places a price that is too high on pristine land, then such valuation will force the immigrant to work

for a long time to save enough to buy it. Should this happen, the danger for the government is that the immigrant could become an independent peasant (Marx 1983: 722) at the expense of governmental interests.

For immigrants, the proceeds from the sale of land at a price that is too prohibitive for wageworkers to afford are seen as funds extorted from wages of labour by virtue of the law of supply and demand. When governments import have-nothings from Europe to the colonies, they do so to keep the wage-labour market full for the benefit of the capitalists: this is called "systematic colonization." In doing so, the supply of labour must be regular, because no labourer would be able to procure land until he has worked for, and accumulated, sufficient money. Only when immigrant labourers have worked for some time and have accumulated sufficient money, can they produce capital for more labourers, in which case such would enable him to bring more labourers into the colony. The mother country wants to prevent such situation and therefore sets a price on land at a "sufficient price", in other words, at an artificially high price that prevents labourers from becoming independent landowners until others could follow in their place. But this "sufficient price" is nothing more than a capitalist ransom that has been extorted from wage-labourers on which the capitalist can retire. Therefore, the wage-labourer must first create capital for the capitalist that will enable him to exploit that same wage-labourer in the colonies and mother country.

For decades the English government practiced a form of "primitive accumulation" (Marx 1983: 723) that was supposed to benefit the colonies. The result, however, was a fiasco when emigrants were simply diverted from English colonies to the USA. In the meantime, the advance of capitalist production in Europe, as well as increasing government pressure, forced a stream of men (and women) for consecutive years to America, ending up in their labour market more rapidly than the natural emigration westwards would have been the case. On the other hand, the American Civil War brought about debt as well as the need for taxes that favoured the rise of a financial aristocracy. They squandered huge parts of public land, and supported speculative companies for the exploitation of e.g. railways or mines – in short; this represented and stimulated the most rapid centralization of capital.

The outcome was that disillusioned emigrant labourers no longer considered America as their Promised Land. Capitalistic advances made great strides, although the lowering of their wages, has not yet reached the same low European levels. What happened was the blatant addition of colonial land on aristocrats and capitalists by

Government. In Australia, for instance, the stream of gold-diggers competed for English commodities. This has even caused the smallest of artisans to acquire an ample "relative surplus labouring population" from the glut of the Australian labour market, where even prostitution prospered as well as it did in London at the time. Fundamentally, both represented expropriation of the labourer (Marx 1983: 723-724), or as captives of their working class circumstances.

How are the above to be understood in the Eastern Cape context, or, can it give rise to new interpretations of history? A few provisional points will suffice. With the second British occupation of the Cape in 1806, they "were determined to keep it" (Grundlingh 1973: 130) when civil government was re-introduced with the arrival of Earl of Caledon in May 1807. Similarly, together with his clear instructions, all civil and military powers vested in him. For his autocratic successor Cradock, liberal institutions in the colonies were incompatible with the unity of the Empire, whilst Lord Charles Somerset was set on anglicising the Dutch. For instance, the arrival of the 1820 Settlers "must be regarded as part of the British Government's policy of anglicising the Cape Dutch" (Grundlingh 1973: 131-132). Two further developments followed: first, the introduction of Representative Government in 1853, and secondly, Responsible Government followed in 1873 – thus, gradually, but unstoppable, British imperialism covered the entire South Africa by 1910.

5. Eastern Cape history and systematic colonialism

Historical writing involves (at least) both fact (Engelbrecht 2010: 40-52) and theory. One challenge thus far in this paper was to present insight into the differences between conditions in the mother country and those that prevailed in the colony. Regardless of finding anything of universal application amidst the endless differences of opinion (Hegel 2005: xiii), we still need to comment about the four uses of Marx's "systematic colonisation" in the Eastern Cape context.

The first half of the 19th century was one of "unremitting struggle" (Peires 2003a: 182) for the Xhosa during the high tide of Colonial rule. By 1800, the most western Xhosa chiefdoms were found at the Sundays River, whilst the Mbashe River and the upper reaches of the Kei River, were the boundaries to the north and east, respectively. Territorially speaking, and only four decades later, by 1847, the situation was different – by this time, the Xhosa kingdom had lost all their land between these

two rivers. They were driven over the Fish River in 1812, then out of the Kat River valley in 1829 and past the Keiskamma in 1847. They lost the Ceded Territory and the Province of Queen Adelaide, with more to follow during the period 1850-1853 to advancing and systematic British colonisation towards the imposition of Representative government. For instance, the period (1860s) during which Sir Philip Wodehouse was governor at the Cape, brought yet another dimension to colonisation. He was a long-time advocate for the incorporation of the economically dependent British Kaffraria into the Colony. In 1865 the British government authorized him by means of the *Kaffrarian Annexation Act* to incorporate British Kaffraria, and in April 1866 such was achieved. In less than a further 40 years, British colonisation of South Africa would be complete, first following Responsible government in the early 1870s and through the Anglo-Boer War of 1899-1902 towards Union in 1910.

Colonists who live in a colony as settlers (often as co-founders), are sometimes either indirectly responsible for, or are at the receiving end of, autocratic colonial policies. Since as early as the 1770s, contact between Colonists and Xhosa in the Eastern Cape, reflected tenuous relations (Giliomee in Elphick and Giliomee 1980: 301). In some respects they were simultaneously competing for the same, but also different, objectives. For instance, whilst the Xhosa wanted an “open” frontier, the colonists preferred a “closed” frontier. In reality it was a situation that did not promote a constant, reliable labour supply. Since capital and labour were periodically scarce, both Xhosa and whites were confined to the same scarce resources. Both competed for the same land and livestock. In order to make up for their losses, cattle raids and military conflicts were perpetrated by both sides (Giliomee in Elphick and Giliomee 1980: 291-293).

The essence of Xhosa division of labour in the homestead was according to age and gender (Peires 2003a: 8). There is evidence that by 1811 Xhosa have already been working in the Colony for 15-20 years. Further evidence indicates that by 1839, two full generations of Xhosa were already born and brought up on white farms of the Eastern Cape. Such signalled the beginning of a permanent class of wage-workers and their subsequent dependency (Peires 2003a: 117) on whites.

Donaldson for instance, distinguished between four groups of labourers: white labourers, of whom some did not continue to do so their entire working lives; slaves as a heterogeneous population comprising of skilled artisans, craftsmen and domestic slaves; prize negroes from foreign trade shipping after 1807 with apprenticeship of 14

years before they were given full freedom, and lastly, Bushmen and Hottentots as herdsmen and wagon-drivers (Donaldson 1972: 25-26). Sir Harry Smith for instance, tried to turn Xhosa hereditary chiefs into salaried magistrates (Peires 2003b: 27) whilst British Settlers quickly picked up on the negative local attitudes towards black labourers. The Xhosa lost more than just their land in the Ceded Territory – they were deprived of their means of subsistence. On white farms, they were forced into labour and squatting subsistence. Furthermore, commerce remained in the hands of traders and missionaries, and in British Kaffraria, they were forced from their lands into the labour market (Peires 2003a: 118, 184, 187, 191). After 50 years of colonisation, labour relations were clearly divided between the impoverishment of many *(amathamba)* and enrichment of few *(amagogotya)* (Peires 2003b: 198).

On the other hand, manufacturing capitalists did not exist in the conventional sense of the word in the Eastern Cape as were already the case in England at the time. This is simply because during the period up to early 1870s, as much as 90% of the Cape population were still employed in agriculture (Scholtz in Muller 1986: 203). Nevertheless, Müller made a strong point regarding the increased economic activity along the southeastern coast between Cape Town and the eastern frontier of the Fish River to 1820. One of the modernising influences was the initiative of private entrepreneurs in the primary and secondary sectors of the economy (Müller 1982). They capitalised on the increased government expenditure after 1806, on, for instance, road building, government involvement in harbour developments, and military expenditure. In addition, one needs to keep in mind the establishment of new towns: housing requirements, government building schools, churches, and farming infrastructure – all lead to some form of elementary diversified manufacture. Lastly, the introduction of coastal transport to the hinterland, overcame the relatively high transportation costs to the Cape market. These markets were serviced by traders (Afrikaans: *smouse*) who were largely agents for capitalists.

Secondly, on numerous occasions the British relied on systematic colonisation as a tool to advance their policies, authority and exploitive economic interests. Despite the fact that historical generalizations are often inadequate, historians cannot do without them. For our purposes, the role of *landdroste* and *heemrade* is a typical colonialist "tool" employed to systematically enhance the colonial justice system. In a detailed study about *landdroste* and *heemrade*, Venter made it clear that they were the *de facto* rulers in the outlying colonial districts. In fact, he continued, the role assigned to them

was of such nature that they influenced all aspects of civic life (Venter 1940). Maj. Cuyler of Uitenhage, and *landdrosts* Albertine and Dundas of Albany were amongst the well-known officials.

When the Europeans first came to the Cape of Good Hope, they did so not for permanent conquest. At the time, the Company had no intention that it should ever grow into anything like a colonial settlement. However, when Van Riebeeck left the Cape in 1662, the settlement "had acquired an air of permanence and something of a character of a colony" (Milton 1983: 1-2). This reality was "most clearly demonstrated by the presence of free burgers. Although the Company initially thought to do no more than to "substitute private for state enterprise, its act was an irrevocable step toward the European colonization of southern Africa" (Milton 1983: 4). This was derived from "changing frontier policies: the first phase was one of annexation of land, expulsion of the Xhosa, and the maintenance of an unoccupied strip of 'neutral territory' separating colonist and Xhosa" (Wilson in Wilson and Thompson 1969: 243). Some authors regarded the Xhosa as a "formidable obstacle in the way of advancing colonists" (Macmillan 1963). They were dealt with by different Colonial policies that varied from time to time until eventually all Xhosa were eventually subjected to Colonial rule.

In addition, The Hundred Years War between 1779 – 1878 (Welsh 2002: 79-87; Peires 2010: 66-68) can also be considered as a "tool" used by Colonial policy makers to expand colonialism through the establishment of military posts across their newly found colonial territories. For instance, after the 1811 frontier war, Cradock established a chain of 27 military posts (Giliomee in Elphick and Giliomee 1980: 315) that were jointly garrisoned by soldiers and burghers for the improved future security of the eastern Frontier (Morse-Jones 1969: 1). This was nothing more than a military attempt to keep the Xhosa to the east of the Fish River. Consequently, troops were stationed at numerous places over the entire Zuurveld (Morse-Jones 1969: 1-3), and for Stapleton, colonial rule led to unjustified colonial dispossession (Stapleton 1994: 10) of the local Xhosa chiefdoms.

Treaties with local Xhosa chiefs served as "tools" to implement systematic colonialism. Van Plettenberg's agreement in 1778 with Gwali chiefs confined the Xhosa territorially. Likewise, lord Charles Somerset and landdrost Cuyler's agreements with Ngqika at the Kat River Conference of 1817, serve as further examples of systematic colonization. The period between c.1836-1846 primarily

regarded Stöckenstroom's treaty system followed by Sir P. Maitland and Sir H. Smith and the D'Urban agreements, as means to achieve systematic colonization ends.

Literature surrounding the role of missionaries is vast, and is characterised by different perspectives. For Thompson, military, commercial and evangelical interests were interpreted as measures employed to bring pressures on the responsible colonial bureaucrats and politicians. For instance, Dr J. Philip was committed to fighting for the liberation of the oppressed classes, whilst the Moravian missionaries were bent on improving the material conditions of Africans rather than trying to influence the structure of the colonial society (Thompson 2007: 53, 58). Both Galbraith and Kapp found Dr Philip's influence as previously been overrated in historical literature (Galbraith 1963, vii; Kapp 1985, 290A). In their endeavours, the various missionaries had mixed levels of success in converting the Xhosa to Christianity. Peires is of the opinion that Christianity had no hope to replace traditional religion, specifically where such attempted to attack Xhosa social institutions (e.g. witchcraft, polygamy, dancing and nudity, or rainmaking). Whilst (he continued), it is true that chiefs collaborated with missionaries, their reasons for doing so were mainly secular. In addition, mission stations were seen as an invasion of the sovereignty of the chiefs (Peires 2003a: 85). Furthermore, in a sense, the influence of the missionaries paved the way for the replacement of chiefs by magistrates. On the other hand, missionaries were sometimes used as councillors, and/or they were involved in playing a conciliatory role between the farmers and Colonial authorities (Davenport 1989: 69, 71, 123).

This ambivalent relationship between Colonial authorities and missionaries made them a limited tool employed to extend colonisation. However, the missionaries in general criticised and opposed Colonial policies towards the Khoi and Xhosa. At first, they were mainly interested in improving their material lot. In this manner, the missionaries created new societies and were seen as a threat to Cape employers. They were concerned that their labourers would desert them and find champions for their grievances (Freund in Elphick and Giliomee 1980: 225) in missionaries. Mission stations served as places of refuge for the Xhosa, not only during times of war, but also for those who were accused of practicing witchcraft. What is clear is that the "difficulties of missionaries were increased by the fact that both white colonial governments and African chiefs tried to use them as political agents" (Wilson in Wilson and Thompson 1969: 267). Davenport explained that one "thread in the incorporation of black chiefdoms within the matrix of a white-controlled state system

was the extension of European values and cultural influences especially as these were promoted by European missionary societies" – missionaries promoted a change in social state and hence trading was often not unrelated to their interests but was mostly a by-product (Davenport 1989: 177, 179) to their evangelical practices.

Yet, trade with the Xhosa remains an important aspect of inter-cultural relations and accordingly Peires allocated due attention to this in his study of the history of the Xhosa (Peires 2003a: 107-117). This is relevant to this study not only because Peires's research covered our research period, but also because of the continually changing regulation of the multi-cultural relations.

By the 1820s, the Xhosa were well connected with white trade, and therefore, the wider European economy. Their trade in cattle, beads, iron and copper were in the first instance not to satisfy material needs, but rather to satisfy their need for an increased wealth, since these goods were increasingly used in financial speculation (Peires 2003a: 107). Xhosa trade with other African communities e.g. the Thlaping in the northeast and to the east, showed beads of Portuguese origin in circulation, thus supporting the point made above.

Although initially, and from the perspective of the Colonial Government, trade with the Boers were illegal (Peires 2003a: 110), such trade in cattle and ivory were mutually beneficial. Nevertheless, on the one hand, the Government placed many restrictions on trade, but at the same time, they needed the trade in meat to supply their military's needs. The result was that the Xhosa became dependent on colonial and Boer trade.

The involvement of the missionaries in trade with the Xhosa, Boers and Colonial Government, clearly show how the Xhosa systematically became part of capitalist colonial expansion. Increasingly they became peasants (Peires 2003a: 116), and eventually, squatters on white farms or labour tenants (Peires 2003a: 118). Their increased proletarian status (Peires 2003a: 119) developed into economic subordination (Peires 2003a: 121) until it reached a peak when they eventually became fully colonised in 1866.

In order to sustain their position, Colonial governors constantly made agreements with the Xhosa and other traditional cultures. Governor Van Plettenberg entered into an agreement with Gwali chiefs in October 1778 (Peires 2003a: 60). In October 1779, Governor Dundas made an agreement with Chungwa allowing him to remain between the Bushmans and Sunday's Rivers, provided that they did not molest the colonists

(Peires 2003a: 63). At the Kat River Conference in 1817, Lord Somerset appropriated the land of Ngqika between the Kat and Keiskamma Rivers as the Ceded Territory (Peires 2003a: 88, 90). In 1824 official trade fairs with the Xhosa were agreed to on a regular basis at Fort Willshire (Peires 2003a: 112 - 113). Ordinance 49 of 1928 regulated employment (hence labour) of blacks on a contractual basis (Peires 2003a: 118, 136). Ordinance 50 freed labour, which resulted in increased demand for land that expanded in geo-political terms further inland. Shortly before Sir P. Maitland arrived at the frontier in 1844, Hare occupied part of the Ceded Territory and established a military post there. Then there were Maitland's treaties that simply replaced those of Stockenström. For instance, Ordinance 3 of 1848 indentured Xhosa to particular employers (Peires 2003a: 190).

Thirdly, "systematic colonisation" serves as a course of action for colonizers to broaden their imperialist influence - both in terms of width and depth. The Colonial rule in South Africa has often been described as autocratic (Walker 1959: 140) – in fact "more autocratic than that of any other British territory" – according to Kotzé (Kotzé in Muller 1986: 118). By 1846 inhabitants experienced a more sympathetic British attitude towards self-government. The old constitution that has been in place from the days of Sir B. D'Urban in 1834, was replaced by a new bicameral parliament effective from 1 July 1853 and would remain so until 1910. Woodhouse requested the British Government to effect federation – a decision to decrease defence expenditure that already by 1850, stood at 3 million pounds.

Lastly, "systematic colonisation" was seen as an end state. The military patrols through the commando system had an end state in mind – to allow a commando to follow the spoor of stolen cattle to the nearest homestead to demand restitution and to re-take Xhosa cattle in lieu of missing colonial cattle (Peires 2003a: 102). Secondly Sir George Grey had a clear "plan to penetrate tribal territory with white-owned farms" (Davenport 1989: 135). The future of British Kaffraria vested on an end state – to be incorporated into the Cape Colony in order to also "take responsibility for British Kaffraria" (Kotzé in Muller 1986: 136). The planned re-annexation of the territory between the Keiskamma and Kei Rivers as British Kaffraria, was in line with what De Kiewiet said that "[t]he *leitmotiv* for all colonial history is growth" (De Kiewiet 1972: v), whilst Thompson referred to continued colonial expansion (Thompson 2007: 66) as a means to such end.

Conclusion

Economic considerations formed an important aspect of 19th century British imperialism. The reality is that British imperialism was based on her sea power for the benefit of her trade requirements. In fact, "[t]he prime motivation for both the Dutch and the British was therefore the protection of their rewarding trade with the East" (Dickason 2011: 38). The argument, then, was that an "economy can only obtain the resources for further expansion through the creation of surplus wealth within its borders or by drawing upon the resources of other countries" (Frankel 1938: 48) and therefore had to extend her sphere of influence. From a commercial point of view, and taking into consideration the vast expansion of British trade at the time, Molseworth's view in 1840, that "all we require is markets and customers," seems rather appropriate. In the same vain, Sir John Russell wrote to Colonial Secretary Sir George Grey that the "loss of any great portion of our Colonies would diminish our importance in the world, and the vultures would soon gather together to despoil us of other parts of our Empire." In this regards Lancaster was clear on e.g. D'Urban's governorship – his "was a military solution designed first and foremost to put the Colony in the most advantageous strategic position with regard to any future aggression (Lancaster 1991: 2). Lastly, in 1838 Sir George Napier wrote to Stockenström about "a [g]overnment based upon impartial justice and humanity, without regards to the colour of the human race." At the time, British colonialism portrayed characteristics of a correlation between state identity, national interests and global roles (Landsberg 2010: 247).

This paper attempted a 21st century interpretation of an old phenomenon, *viz.* colonization - one that is philosophically speaking, becoming more difficult to distinguish from contemporary approaches to globalization (Engelbrecht 2011) and recent debates surrounding imperialism. It attempted to explain what is wrong in colonial social reality, identified some actors to change it, and provided areas for criticism and practical goals for the future (Bohman in Rasmussen 1996: 190) relation between 19th century labour and capitalist.

From the beginning, cross-cultural contact in the Eastern Cape took place against a background of growing state power and authoritarian rule. Such was not always the common wisdom. It is not surprising that later, Adorno studied (although in a

different context) the relationship between certain character traits of rulers in power, and political options (Adorno 1950). Further insight into, and application of, modern Critical Theory will benefit our understanding of our South African past with regards to authoritarian rule.

At a time of rapid historical change, colonial rule was in some instances disorderly, fragmented, even inchoate and at best, foreign, to the Eastern Cape peoples. The function of colonialism refers to the role it plays in the larger international political economic system of which its forms a part in an attempt to preserve such. However, when it does not enhance or perpetuate the desired end state, it is dysfunctional and it operates on one of various levels. Apart from the international level, our view is that it operates on the national and or sub-national level/s as well. In the Eastern Cape, it operates at the sub-sub-national level.

Initially, the British government preferred not to expand its colonial possessions because of the high cost of e.g. military conflict. Nevertheless, later they typically reacted to conflict by constantly annexing new territories and then either reversing or extending colonial rule (Crais 2002: 10-11, 14) - in a sense, we find incoherent practices of reluctant imperialism. However, after the discovery of diamonds and gold, spirited colonial expansion (Crais 2002: 14) was at the order of the day. Some fifty years later, Lenin explained that the place of imperialism in history, was based on the growth of monopoly out of colonial policies, and how this developed by "the 'free grabbing' of territories" (Lenin 2010: 157). Such was the case in the 19th century South African context.

It would be incorrect to assume that growing colonisation realities did not lead to large-scale opposition from the colonists. In fact it did. This is not the place nor do we have the space, but to make a few observations to the Eastern Cape alone. In the early 1990s Stead dealt in detail with the Eastern Cape Separatist Movement, and hence we state only the following: firstly, the Separatists wanted to move the centre of government from the Cape to the Eastern Cape; they wanted a completely separate colony to be established in the East; they wanted federal devolution of powers to a resident government, but lastly, their inability to agree amongst themselves about what they wanted, were the result of their political ineptitude (Stead 1984: vii) and hence a major contributing factor to the failure of the Movement.

Previous historical interpretations based on traditional theory regarding the representation of state power and of colonial injustices, need to be re-interpreted e.g.

in terms of forced resettlements of societies that were simply unwanted in certain territorial areas at specific times. This is so because the past has a bearing on the future, whilst in turn, our present day problems should not influence our critique of the past (Lancaster 1991: vii).

From the beginning, all South African cross-cultural contacts were characterised by great inequalities, rule by authoritarian personalities that inevitably had to contend with resistance following their oppressive rule, and unacceptable colonising practices. For instance, agencies of government tried to solve the "native problem" through advanced technologies of their time over e.g. labour and tribalism. Permissive factors such as cultural arrogance, racial superiority and economic greed, were representative of power, as well as serving as an example of how modern colonial bureaucracies of the 19th century functioned and finally, failed in South Africa.

In terms of future research, the following matrix could assist to provide combinations of traditional factors (financial, commercial, imperial and philanthropic) and their relative influence on Marx's four contexts of systematic colonization.

	Marx's four contexts of systematic colonisation			
Muller's classification	Creation of manufacturing capitalists.	As a tool for advancing capitalism.	As a strategy.	As an end state.
Financial factors.				
Commercial factors.				
Imperial protection.				
Philanthropic factors.				

However, an immediate criticism of the above could be Galbraith's view that the "factors underlying the decisions of imperial administrators at the Cape are not easily reducible to neat, clean categories" (Galbraith 1963: vii – viii). It is therefore prudent to be cognisant of previous historical interpretations of apparent paradoxes inherent in

British colonial policy towards South Africa (Galbraith 1963: 1-9). In this regard, Critical Theory offers possibilities of analysing the nature of colonial domination.

Bibliography

Adorno, T. 2009. *In search of Wagner.* Reprint. (With a new forward by S. Źiźek, and translated by R. Livingstone). Verso Books, London and New York.

Adorno, T. (et. al.) 1950. *The authoritarian personality*. Harper and Brothers, New York.

Altusser, L. 2000. *Machiavelli and us.* Verso, London.

Crais, C. 2002. *The politics of evil. Magic, state power, and the political imagination in South Africa.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Davenport, T. R. H. 1989. *South Africa. A modern history.* 2nd impression. Southern Book Publishers, Bergvlei.

De Kiewiet, C. W. 1972. *A history of South Africa. Social and economic.* Reprint. Oxford University Press, London.

Dickason, G. B. 2005. "Colonialists and colonists", in *Toposcope,* Vol. xxxvi, pp. 35-39.

Dickason, G. 2011. "Moving frontiers – The Cape Colony 1652-1900", in *Toposcope,* Vol. xlii, pp. 34-38.

Donalson, M. E. 1972. "Settlers and servants", in *Annals*, 1972, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 25-26.

Eldridge, E. A. and Morton, F. (eds.) 1994. *Slavery in South Africa. Captive labor on the Dutch frontier.* Westview Press, Boulder, San Francisco and Oxford.

Elphick, R. and Giliomee, H. (eds.) 1980. *The shaping of South African society, 1652-1820.* Second impression. Longman Penguin Southern Africa, Cape Town.

Engelbrecht, C. 2010. "Limitations in history." Part 1. "Problems with historical facts", in *Toposcope,* Vol. xli, pp. 40-52.

Engelbrecht, C. 2011. "Globalization theory and reference to aspects of Eastern Cape (South Africa) history", in http://africalit.nai.uu.se (Retrieved on 25/5/2011), pp. 1-10.

Frankel, S. H. 1938. *Capital investment in Africa.* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Galbraith, J. S. 1963. *Reluctant empire. British policy on the South African frontier 1834 – 1854.* University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Grundlingh, M. A. S. 1973. "The Parliament of the Cape of Good Hope, with specific reference to party politics, 1872-1910", in *Archives Year Book for South African History*. Thirty- second Year, Vol. II. The Government Printer, Pretoria.

Harrington, A. L. 1973. "*The Graham's Town Journal* and The Great Trek, 1834-1843", in *Archives Year Book for South African History.* Thirty-second Year, Vol. II. Government Printer, Pretoria.

Hegel, G. W. F. 2005. *Philosophy of right.* (Translated by S. W. Dyde). Dover Philosophical Classics. Dover Publications, Inc., New York.

Inggs, J. 1988. "Port Elizabeth's response to the expanding economy of Europe 1820-1870", in *The South African Journal of Economic History,* Vol. 3, Sept., No. 2, pp. 61-84.

Kapp, P. H. 1985. "Dr. John Philip. Die Grondlegger van Liberalisme in Suid-Afrika", in *Argiefjaarboek vir Suid-Afrikaanse Geskiedenis.* Agt-en-Veertigste Jaargang, Deel 11. Die Staatsdrukker, Pretoria.

King, T. 2005. "The story of the 1820 Settlers", in http://www.eggsa.org/1820-settlers (Retrieved on 24/1/2011), pp. 1-15.

Lancaster, J. C. S. 1991. "The Governorship of Sir Benjamin D'Urban at the Cape of Good Hope, 1834-1838", in *Archives Year Book for South African History.* Fifty-fourth Year, Vol. II. The Government Printer, Pretoria.

Landsberg, C. 2010. *The diplomacy of transformation. South African foreign policy and statecraft.* Pan Macmillan, Johannesburg.

Lenin,V. I. 2010. *Imperialism: the highest stage of capitalism. A popular outline.* Penguin Books, London.

Machiavelli, N. 2009. *The prince.* (Translated and annotated by P. Constantine). Vintage Books, London.

Macmillan, W. M. 1963. *Bantu, Boer, and Briton. The making of the South African native problem.* The Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Marx, K. 1983. *Capital. A critique of political economy.* Vol. I. (Translated by S. Moore and E. Aveling. Edited by F. Engels). Reprint. Lawrence & Wishart, London.

Marx, K. 1985. *Wage labour and capital.* Reprint. Progress Publishers, Moscow.

Milton, J. 1983. *The edges of war. A history of frontier wars 1702-1878.* Juta & Co.,

Ltd., Cape Town.

Morse-Jones, E. 1969. *Roll of the British Settlers in South Africa. Part I up to 1876.* A. A. Balkema, Cape Town.

Müller, A. L. 1982. "Aspects of the development of the Cape, 1795-1820." (Unpublished paper read at the second conference of the Economic History Society of Southern Africa, held in Durban in July 1982), pp. 1-40.

Muller, C. F. J. 1969. *Die Britse owerheid en die Groot Trek.* H & R Academica, Pretoria and Cape Town.

Muller, C. F. J. 1974. *Die oorsprong van die Groot Trek.* Tafelberg-Uitgewers Beperk, Cape Town and Johannesburg.

Muller, C. F. J. (ed.) 1986. *500 Years. A history of South Africa.* 5th edition. Academica, Pretoria and Cape Town.

Peires, J. 2003a. *The house of Phalo. A history of the Xhosa people in the days of their independence.* Jonathan Ball Publishers, Johannesburg and Cape Town.

Peires, J. 2003b. *The dead will arise. Nongqawuse and the great Xhosa cattle-killing of 1856-7.* Jonathan Ball Publishers, Johannesburg and Cape Town.

Peires, J. 2010. "An early history of the Zuurveld", in *Toposcope,* Vol. xli, pp. 66-68.

Rasmussen, D. M. (ed.) 1996. *The handbook of critical theory.* Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

Saunders, C. C. 1976. "The Annexation of the Transkeian Territories", in *Archives Year Book for South African History.* The Government Printer, Pretoria.

Stapleton, T. J. 1994. *Maqoma. Xhosa resistance to colonial advance 1798-1873.* Jonathan Ball Publishers, Johannesburg.

Stead, J. L. 1984. "The development and failure of the Eastern Cape separatist movement", in *Archives Year Book for South African History*, Forty-fifth Year, Vol. II. The Government Printer, Pretoria.

Thompson, L. 2007. *A history of South Africa.* Reprint. Jonathan Ball Publishers, Johannesburg and Cape Town.

Van Dyke, V. 1978. *Political science. A philosophical analysis.* Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

Venter, P. J. 1940. "Landdros en Heemrade (1682-1827)", in *Archives Year Book for South Africa History*, Vol. III, Part II. Government Printer, Cape Town.

Walker, E. A. 1959. *A history of Southern Africa.* Reissue. Longmans, London.

Welsh, F. 2002. *A history of South Africa.* Revised and updated.

_____

HarperCollins*Publishers*, London.

Wilson, M. and Thompson, L. (eds.) 1969. *The Oxford History of Southern Africa.* Vol.1. *South Africa to 1870.* Clarendon Press, Oxford.